DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 151 SO 015 449

AUTHOR Acker, Joan
TITLE Gender and the Construction of Class.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual American Sociological Association Meeting (Detroit, MI, August 31-September 4, 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Capitalism; Employed Women; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Females; Labor Force; Males; Marxian Analysis; *Sex; Sex Bias; Sex Discrimination; Sexuality; *Social Class; *Social Structure; Sociology; Wages
IDENTIFIERS Ideology

ABSTRACT

Only by recognizing that class is not gender neutral can the processes of class formation and reproduction be understood. Class is defined as a process in which human beings take an active part, rather than a structure of categories into which individuals may be inserted. Gender organizes or structures class in many different ways. For example, capitalist class structures have always been divided by gender through the sexual division of labor in both paid and unpaid labor. Wages are also gendered. In every wage-based society women earn less than men, and women's jobs have lower wages than men's jobs. Images of work and labor are intertwined with images of gender and sexuality in ideologies that support the class structure. These ideas become incorporated, in the process of experience, in core images of the self that then inform further action, becoming part of the complex process of maintaining class structures. In the same process, gender inequalities are also reproduced. A gendered conception of class provides a better understanding of women's economic situation than does a theoretical approach that separates the problems of class oppression and sex oppression. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED247151

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan Acker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

GENDER AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF CLASS

BY JOAN ACKER

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

SØ 015 449

Gender and the Construction of Class

by Joan Acker

Department of Sociology

Center for the Study of Women in Society

University of Oregon

Neither non-Marxist nor Marxist feminist sociologists have been entirely successful in integrating an understanding of women's disadvantages into a theoretical analysis of class divisions in late capitalist societies (see Acker, 1980; Barrett, 1980; Sargent, 1981; Sokoloff, 1981). However, a large body of work now exists that provides the materials for a better understanding of gender inequality and class and some very good examples of historical and contemporary description do give us such integrated accounts for particular places and periods (e.g., Sen, 1980). In this paper I draw on the work of others to outline some of the components of an analysis of class structure that attempts to go beyond capitalism-patriarchy arguments toward a different linking of class and gender.

Theories that attempt to integrate class and sex usually assume that class is a gender indifferent term referring to a gender neutral phenomenon.(1) I argue the opposite - that only by recognizing that class is not gender neutral can we understand the processes of class formation and reproduction as they involve women as well as men. I suggest that the structuring of class is partly through gender; that gender, both as a basis for the division of

work and power and as a powerful focus of meaning and action, is central in the organizing and reproducing of class relations.

The conviction that class structure is gendered comes from taking the perspective of women (Smith, 1977, a and b; 1979) in analyzing social relations. When one looks at the social world from the standpoint of women, when one takes the experience of women as what is to be explained (in contrast, for example, to taking the survival of capitalist control as what is to be explained), gender always enters the explanation. Women look out upon the world as women, and the world looks back at them as women. The same may be said for men, although this is obscured by the multiplicity of practices that define men as general human beings. Much of social life is organized around the fact that there are two sexes. The social structuring of that fact and the meaning we give to it is what we call gender. Thus, gender is a central organizing principle of all societies, including class society.(2)

Before clarifying the statement that class is not gender neutral, and that the structuring of class proceeds partly on the terms set by gender, I discuss the concept of class from which I start.

My starting point is a particular interpretation of the Marxist concept of class. In this view, class is a process in which human beings take an active part, rather than a structure of categories into which individuals may be inserted. Class is "something which in fact happens (and can be shown to have happened) in human relationships" (E.P. Thompson, 1963: 9). It

is a process in which the relations of exploitation as well as the potentiality for their disruption are reproduced as people try to cope with and understand their daily existence. The limiting conditions of those relations are, to a great extent, produced outside the control or even the knowledge of most people, in the places where decisions about the production and allocation of capital are made. In the context of these conditions, class relations are reproduced in the ongoing procedures and practices of the organizations where people eat, sleep, work, study, are governed and taxed and carry out other activities. Working people help to reproduce those relations every day as they voluntarily get the kids off to school, show up at work, go to union meetings, and perform other routines of life that are the actuality of class. As E.P. Thompson puts it, "Class formations arise at the intersection of determination and self-activity" (1978, p. 298). Although determination may be, ultimately, in the historically concrete mode of production, and the social relations of production are essential in setting the conditions of class experience, these social relations do not arise outside of human agency. However, human agency often appears to groups or individuals as given and remote conditions, realities over which most people have little or no control. These manifestations of human action we often usefully call structures and they can sometimes be described statistically. For example, we can count the number of people who fall into categories defined by authority in the work place and control over economic resources (e.g., Wright, 1982) or we can develop statistical measures of the sex segregation of the work force. But

these are only frozen traces of the real relations and should not be confused with the living relations from which these traces are constructed.

Keeping that in mind, we can talk about class structure. I assume that there is a working class defined by lack of ownership or control over the means of production and dependence on a wage that includes people who earn wages in clerical, service, and blue collar jobs. I also assume that there are important differences between working class experience and the experience of those who also live on wages or salaries but who have more autonomy, control, and money. This grouping we can refer to as the middle class. Moreover, there is a class that is in a position to dominate and determine much of what happens to the rest of us; their actions, including the allocation of capital on a world scale, affect us all.

The unexceptional view of class outlined above appears genderless, but actually is modeled on the concrete activities of men and is thus a gendered, and partial picture. The picture is partial in two senses. First, women's patterns of unpaid and paid labor are ignored so that the experience of only half the population is represented in the concept. Second, the fiction of genderlessness obscures many of the processes that maintain class relations, for men as well as for women. When women are introduced, gender becomes visible, the picture becomes more complex, and widens to include more activities in areas outside of paid work, as well as within the confines of the work place. To

spell out the implications of class as gendered requires reconsidering what we mean by relations of production, the wage relation, the division of labor, the labor process, class consciousness and class conflict. The task also requires consideration of the several processes that are implied in the concept of reproduction. This is a very large project. In this paper I will only suggest some of the steps in such a rethinking. These constitute both placing well known facts in a gendered class framework and drawing out the implications of others' research for such a view of class. A number of other sociologists are exploring the idea that the construction of gender is intricately involved with the production of class. This seems to be an understanding emerging in Australia (e.g., Connell, et al., 1982), Britain (e.g., Willis, 1980; Phillips and Taylor, 1980), and the U.S. (Smith, 1977a) at about the same time.

We can look at the ways in which gender organizes or structures class in many differnt ways. I will illustrate this at two levels, the aggregate level of occupational structuring in the U.S. and the interactional level of the production of consciousness and ideology.

Class as Gender-divided

Capitalist class structures have always been divided by gender, through the sexual division of labor in both paid and unpaid labor, in production and reproduction (for summaries see, e.g., Barrett, 1980; Sokoloff, 1981; Comer, 1977). Those

divisions were, and are, written into law and custom. The sexual division of labor has not substantially decreased with the movement of larger and larger proportions of women into paid labor.(3) The division has simply been altered from one clearly demarcated by the lines between paid and unpaid labor to one segmented along lines of sex in both the paid occupational structure and the home (Vaneck, 1978; Berk and Berk, 1979). This sexual division of labor constitutes part of the reality of class, the conditions that set the limits of action. Sex-based divisions are suffused with gender meanings that then help to recreate the divisions. Occupations are, daily and over longer periods of time, continually recreated as sex-typed and the allocation of capital and the organization of production are usually implicated in that process. The consequences for both women and men vary, but often women are the losers.(4) One contemporary example will illustrate the point. Parts of the electronics industry have been moved outside the U.S. to Southeast Asia and other areas of the world where wages are low and there is available a young female labor force. These workers are attractive to the industry because they are young and female, unorganized and perceived to be easily controlled. U.S. workers, primarily female, lose their jobs; Asian women find highly exploitative work (Elson and Pearson, 1981); all workers in the U.S. are weakened, it could be argued, as another industry evades unionization, and takes its jobs elsewhere. Thus, the export of capital that reduces available jobs in the U.S. and allows corporations to avoid unionization is at least partly dependent upon the existence of gender structures in other societies.

Corporate manufacturers make use of gender to maximize profits, and this affects women, men and class structures differentially.

Wages as well as jobs are gendered. The wage appears to be a gender-neutral process only in its most abstract and intellectualized form - as a concrete human relation it is almost always gendered, or gender specific. In every wage-based society women earn less than men and women's jobs have lower wages than men's jobs. This is one sense in which wages are gendered: the going accepted rate for women is lower than that for men. A fair wage for women is not the same as a fair wage for men. Efforts to understand why this should be so lead to questions about common conceptualizations of wage determination processes. In Marxist theory, the wage is held to approximate the value of labor power, which in turn approximates the cost of the socially necessary labor to reproduce that labor power. If women are, in general and everywhere, paid less than men, the cost of their reproduction must, in general, be lower. But, this is difficult to support, unless we argue that the jobs women do are less skilled than those that men do, requiring less education and thus costing less to reproduce. Empirical studies of the effects of human capital differences on the earnings gap between the sexes, although informed by a different theory, are useful in exploring this issue. Such studies consistently show an unexplained wage gap (Treiman and Hartmann, 1981). One approach to understanding the unexplained gap is the argument that gender enters into the definition of skill, so that female dominated jobs are defined as less valuable than male dominated jobs, leading to lower pay. (Phillips and Taylor, 1980).

The movement for comparable worth has taken the issue to the courts (e.g., Cook, 1983) and in the effort to achieve legal redress, still more systematic evidence is being generated.

The gender specific nature of the wage is, of course, closely tied to the sex-typing and sex segregation of jobs. Changes underway are altering the old gender divided occupational structure and producing new bases for the gender divisions of class. Gender divisions may be in the process of becoming more pronounced, particularly in the working class. The old working class had its roots in a gender stratified work organization in industrial occupations that were predominantly male. The proportion of the total labor force in these occupations is declining in most industrial countries. At the same time, the service and clerical occupations are expanding and becoming ever more dominated by women, producing a new female working class. These occupations tend to have the characteristics of women's work in the old working class--jobs are routine, closely supervised, defined as unskilled or semi-skilled, and low paid. Thus, working class jobs continue to be split into male and female sectors, but the male sector is declining, the female sector is expanding, and the "working class" is becoming more and more female. Support for this contention is provided by the work of Wright, et al. (1977, 1982) who have found that around 60% of women are working class, while only 40% of men can be so identified when using a definition of working class as those without authority in the structure of work.

Within the large professional-technical-managerial grouping of occupations, contradictory changes seem to be taking place (Burris and Wharton, 1982). Some sectors are becoming less predominantly male, while others remain either male or female dominated, and still others are moving toward male domination. For example, women are going into some of the old professions such as medicine and law in growing proportions, particularly into practice in organizations rather than into private practice. These occupations are, of course, internally gender stratified with women in the less rewarded and less prestigeous areas (Epstein, 1981). Women are also being accepted, although in small numbers, at the lower managerial and expert levels in government and the private sector. In the U.S., the managerial and technical world is still primarily male, and this is probably true of the newly emerging high tech areas as it is of the older technical areas, in spite of some highly publicized female success stories. Some of the older realms of female dominance, such as nursing, are being invaded by males and others, such as school administration, have been for some time and continue to be male dominated.

Part-time work for women--most part-timers are women in all industrial societies--is another line along which work is sex-divided. Part-time also constitutes a structuring that is internal to the female sectors of the class structure. That is, new and important differences between women within class formations complicate the structural picture. Full-time workers, part-time workers, and full-time housewives are all in different situations vis-a-vis the economic relations of the society. But that is too

simple a view and is a product of a snapshot taken at one moment. The reality is that most women move between these positions during their adult lives, so that their economic status is a shifting one (Moen, 1983). Only a small minority of women are life-long, full-time workers in the male model. These typical work patterns of women lead to doubts about the utility of a concept of class that rests upon the social relations of production when these are seen as stable and continuing relations between the worker and the capitalist. Women are workers with fluctuating and various relations to capitalist production. We must build this complexity into our notion of class if it is to help analyze the reality of women's lives.

Gender and the Reproduction of Class

Class relations, as well as the sex divisions of class, are maintained and reproduced partly through the processes that also reproduce masculinity and femininity. Images of work and labor are intertwined with images of gender and sexuality in ideologies that support the class structure. These ideas become incorporated, in the process of experience, in core images of the self that then inform further action, becoming part of the complex process of maintaining class structures. In the same process, gender inequalities are also reproduced.

In particular, values of masculinity are elaborated and reaffirmed in the process of learning to work and working (Willis, 1980; Tolson, 1977); either explicitly or implicity, the social

place of women is defined and redefined in the same process. Femininity is also constructed as girls or women learn women's work. The social construction of femininity and masculinity, although it certainly happens in many areas of life, goes on in the relations between worker and worker and boss and worker. These relations are part of the process of class and the relations of class are played out, and reconstructed, in the same processes that give content to self-definition and images of masculinity and femininity.

The above statements are assertions that might better be stated as problems for research. However, there is already considerable evidence that can be brought to bear, although not all of it has been produced by systematic studies done in the approved social science mode.

That working class masculinity is complexly connected to modes of behavior and belief that denigrate women and relegate them to the status of not too competent, dependent and/or sex object is supported by two studies of working class males, Sennett and Cobb's (1973) study of adult working class men in Boston and Paul Willis' (1980) study of working class boys in Hammerton. In both these studies, the authors were interested in how class persists in societies with ideals of freedom and equality and the absence of any external compulsion to make men work. Willis makes explicit connections between gender and class as he describes how a group of nonconforming boys reverse the common evaluation of manual work as less respectable and less desirable than mental work, coming to see

manual labor as embodying all the values of masculinity at the same time that they interpret mental labor as effeminate. Mental labor is associated with females who are devalued and objectified in the processes of defining an aggressive masculinity. Embracing this masculinity and the life of factory workers that accompanies it, they come to accept their fate in the labor force and at the same time to construct gender identities that require women to be defined as different from and less than men. This is only one type of working class masculinity, as Connell and associates (1982) point out. The process of linking class and masculinity is complex, occurring in many ways, and cannot be described in a mechanistic model.

Sennett and Cobb's workers were older and less-nonconformist, but the interaction of gender and class was equally complicated. Sennett and Cobb argue that these working class men defined themselves in various ways against the hidden injuries of class, the imputation that they are responsible for their own failure "to make it" and thus are not worthy of respect. One of the ways of earning respect as a man is to sacrifice for the wife and children. Sacrifice involves working long and hard, usually at demanding jobs, and this ties them to the system. However, sacrifice does not bring the rewards of respect and legitimacy, but rather produces new anxieties and further doubts about the self. This internalization of responsibility for one's situation supports the class system. Sennett and Cobb do not discuss the consequences of their husbands' sacrifices for the wives of these working class men. But they are obviously discussing the working class man who

bases much of his feeling of masculine pride on his ability to support his family. The other side of this reality is the dependent wife who must accept the support (Gronseth, 1971).

This material also suggests ways that identifying masculinity with virtue and hard work helps to create divisions within the working class. The men in Sennett and Cobb's study expressed anger and hostility toward "welfare chiselers." Welfare chiselers are men who do not take seriously their responsibilities, who do not support their wives and children. The outraged dignity of working class men who have sacrificed for their families, only to see welfare support the families of men who have refused to sacrifice, is a final attempt to gain respect. The self-righteous, who has found legitimation through sacrifice, turns his anger against others who are also oppressed rather than toward the system that oppresses them both. Thus, the status quo is given further support. Although this basis of male identity is challenged as more women share the role of provider (Bernard, 1981a), there is evidence that for many men, masculine self respect still hangs on the ability to hold a steady job (Schlozman, 1976), even if that job is not the sole source of family support.

Willis' study suggests that working class solidarity may be, at least partly, built upon a combative masculinity that provides a focus around which group identity forms. In the group he studied, there was an ongoing process of both physical and verbal combat that tested and validatd group membership. Often identified as play, as fun, the process also constituted proof of toughness and

masculinity. The fathers of Willis's boys reported similar sorts of play on the shop floor. Tough masculinity produced in informal contacts between male workers may also be part of trade union militance (Tolson, 1977; Stewart, 1981). In some recent interviews I did in Sweden it was suggested that one of the reasons that women are not active trade unionists as often as men is that young men may be taught, as they enter the job, about how to confront the boss, what is the proper masculine - and trade union - stance to authority in the work place. Women, because they are outside the informal male groups, and just because they are women, are not inducted into the work place culture in the same way, even if they happen to be there. Female solidarity may take other forms that no one identifies as class solidarity because it does not occur in masculine mode.(5)

Evidence exists that aggressive masculinity almost always involves the denigration of women.(6) There is also evidence that the relations between men that produce class solidarities often involve the commodification of women. Although I know of no systematic study of this, it seems that all-male settings, whether the object is work or play, are often places where men reaffirm masculinity and the exploitation of women. From pin-up pictures on the walls and doors to idle conversation and joking, the ambience is one in which women are to be laughed at and consumed. This may be more frequent in the U.S. than in Europe, but is another area to explore in developing our knowledge of the ways in which masculinity enters into male solidarity and thus into male class solidarity. Sexual harrassment on the job is also often a mode of

expressing male solidarity while objectifying and excluding women from the group (Enarson, 1981). Again, toughness, the ability to do a hard job that requires physical strength, is associated with sexual aggressiveness that turns women into objects of prey rather than human beings.

This suggests that masculinity may have contradictory implications in the ongoing reproduction of class - on the one hand it is a basis for class solidarity and helps to shape the terms in which class conflict is played out. On the other hand, an aggressive masculinity that separates itself from and denigrates women undermines women's participation and their solidarity with men. That women's efforts to organize have often occurred in the face of male union indifference or opposition is well known (e.g., Wertheimer, 1977).

Masculinity is further tied to ideologies of work in capitalist societies through the notion of skill. A man not only works hard, he also has skills that demonstrate his superiority to women. Gender, as noted above, enters definitions of what is skilled and unskilled work, dividing and separating workers and leading the more advantaged to focus energy on claims to higher pay and other preogatives rather than on issues common to all workers. Phillips and Taylor (1980, p. 79) argue that "Far from being an objective economic fact, skill is often an ideological category imposed on certain types of work by virtue of the sex and power of the workers who perform it." The extent to which this occurs has been revealed in the U.S. as the issue of "comparable worth" has

been raised. The argument is that the skills required for the tasks of female-defined jobs have been consistently under valued or ignored. As a consequence, women's jobs have been defined as less skilled than those of men and have been paid less on the grounds of the lower skill demands. Some studies have been done to examine this question and to begin to redefine the skills of women's jobs (e.g., Cook, 1983). The issue has been taken up in recent court cases, but is far from resolved. The redefinition of women's work to erase the equations of male with skilled and female with unskilled may be difficult. One reason Phillips and Taylor suggest, is that the defense of maculinity may enter into struggles over the deskilling of work. Citing some examples from contemporary research, they also note that:

> It is an irony of great concern to feminists that one of the most celebrated episodes in the history of British class struggle - the Shop Stewards Movement of the First World War - drew its strength from the resistance of men workers to a dilution of their jobs by women. Here the battle against deskilling was reinforced and fuelled by the rejection of women's entry into men's jobs. The perpetuation of sexual hierarchy has been inextricably interwoven with the struggles against the real subordination of capital, as claims to skilled status have come to rely more and more on the sex of the workers and less and less on the nature of the job." (p. 86).

They suggest further that (p. 87) "the identification of 'women's

work" with unskilled work has masked the process through which capitalist work in general has become more routinized, more deadening, more a denial of the humanity of those who perform it. The segregation of women's work from men's conceals from many men workers the ways in which we are all becoming "women workers' now."

It is not only in the working class that masculinity and its symbols help to reproduce aspects of class relations. What follows is speculative, but again constitutes possible questions for research on how masculinity is reproduced as part of the process of class relations in managerial and ruling sectors. For example, as numerous feminists have observed, authority and control are masculine concepts. It does not take any research for us to see that, in general, men are assumed to naturally have authority, to naturally be in positions of control, while women are not. Such images of masculinity are also linked to ideas of rationality. Rationality confers power; rationality is masculine. To be masculine is to be rational and to focus on the technical problems of getting things done. Masculine inexpessiveness is an aspect of rationality; one must forget emotional involvement to make effective decisions and to wield power (Sattell, 1982). Sattel suggests that "inexpressiveness might be more characteristic of upper-class, powerful males than of men in the working classes" (Sattel, 1982:163). Moreover, expressiveness may be either positive-empathetic or negative-combative, as Johnson, et al, (1975) have observed. Negative-combativeness is more stereotypically masculine than is positive empathy. Class differences in patterns of both inexpressiveness and negative

expressiveness among men might be worth investigating.

Abstract thought also has connotations of masculinity in our culture. Thus mental labor, as well as manual labor, becomes defined as masculine in the dominant ideology of late capitalism. Women are seen as not quite capable in areas of abstract thought. If they are, they are thinking like men. The recent success of a few women in male dominated fields such as law has probably not altered this perception. Masculinity is at stake in the male monopoly over mental work and over the positions of control in our societies. Managerial-professional class masculinity undoubtedly takes a variety of forms from the relatively asexual yet powerful masculinity of the scientist (Keller, 1983) to the frankly sexual and exploitative masculinity of many men in political power. Masculinity also articulates different modes of moral justification such as the affectively neutral duty and obligation of the public servant (Tolson, 1977:p.82) or the corporate executive's devotion to organizational goals of expansion and profit in the name of societal welfare.

The working class image of masculinity as involving physical power and manual labor has not disappeared among men of the managerial and professional class or men of the bourgeoisie. At the level of cultural images (and everyday actions) there is the possibility of cross-class bonding between men. (Smith, 1977b) Although Willis' working class boys may reject mental labor, middle class men do not reject the values of physically powerful masculinity. Physical prowess plays a role in the establishment of

male identity and in the learning of masculine behaviors needed for success and power. For example, sports are still very important in the upbringing of boys destined for leading positions. Particularly the aggressive, team sports are held to be a superb training ground for later success in business and industry. These sports teach subordination of the self to higher authority at the same time that they inculcate strategies for combining individual competitiveness with team efforts. Moreover, both active and passive participation in sports produce a folklore that becomes an important part of male culture, and a basis for the exclusion of females from male decision making groups.

My tentative conclusion is that for men who manage, men who design, men who create ideology, and undoubtedly also men who make the broadest decisions about capital and politics, there is an inherent interconnection between work, masculinity, and the inferiority of women. These connections are perpetuated in daily activities that reproduce both class relations and male advantage within the class structure.

Ideas of masculine work and a male-defined class structure are imbedded in socialist theories that have informed Western trade union and working class movements. These ideas may play a role similar to that of other ideologies of masculinity and work; ideas of class based on an implicit male model may obscure essential processes that maintain the class system. The concept of class, as an essential part of the organizing of trade unions and of left political groups in general, has a practical political

significance. The insistence on the primacy of a gender-neutral class, structured only through paid work, in theoretical explanation and in political action constitutes , often, a refusal to look at the part that gender plays in the structuring of power, and thus of class relations. Back of the failure of trade union leaders (male) to pay much attention to organizing women or to deal seriously with women's issues once they are organized, may lie an unrecognized assumption that real working class issues are those that have been defined by the male working class. If women are to be helped, it is through social welfare provisions, such as day care centers, that might lighten their double day. But, challenges to the prevailing sexual inequalities at work are exceedingly rare. Thus, men on the left also avoid an analysis of their own masculinity and the ways it is implicated in their careers as leaders and producers of ideology.

As the concept of class constructs an ideology that obscures the workings of gender, it also obscures an essential part of the process that keeps the class structure in daily operation. A concept that obscures an important part of a system of oppression constitutes an ideology that helps to preserve that system of oppression. However, at the same time, class is still a potentially revolutionary, and liberating idea. The understanding of capitalist exploitation and an appreciation of the possibilities of eliminating it are also imminent in the idea of class, even though contemporary changes in capitalist societies, including changes in women's work, require rethinking this concept (Plotke, 1980). At the present time, class may play a contradictory

political role, both illuminating and making invisible important components of today's conflicts. Recent historical and contemporary work on the antagonisms between socialist and feminist movements is beginning to document this contradictory ideological role of class (see, e.g. Rowbotham, Segal and Wainwright, 1979).

Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that class relations must be understood as gendered. If we wish to understand how class occurs, we must talk about real people actually carrying out their daily activities. But, when we talk about real people, we see that they are always male or female, always gendered. Adequate theories must take this gendered reality, manifested in both action and meaning, into account. As one step in doing this with the concept of class, I have briefly discussed how gender divides the class structure and how it enters the reproduction of class relations. I believe that we gain a better understanding of women's situation in such a gendered conception of class than with a theoretical approach that essentially separates the problems of class oppression and sex oppression.

Footnotes

1. This assumption has been identified as one of the reasons that Marxist theory had difficulty accounting for women's oppression. Some writers (e.g., Acker, 1980; Young, 1981) argue that theories of patriarchal capitalism leave unaltered the Marxist concept of class and thus do not question the assumption that class is gender neutral.

2. Conceptual confusion may arise from the usage "gender and class." Often the implication is that gender and class stand for parallel phenomena which can be compared. I think that interpretation is incorrect. The concept "class" refers to groups of people with different and often opposing interests produced in the ongoing processes of capitalism, or, sometimes, other political-economic systems. Gender refers to the social construction of both the material and ideological differentiation of the female and the male. In my use of the term gender, no opposing interests or essential inequality are implied. Gender often involves inequality, but the term does not refer to a system of conflicting and opposing interests per se. A discussion with Nona Glazer alerted me to the importance of this issue.

3. Some decline in sex segregation in the professions has occurred recently (Burris and Wharton, 1982), but is difficult to interpret because there may be continuing sex differentiation within these occupations. In the labor force as a whole, sex segregation has declined little.

4. A voluminous literature deals with both process and outcome. For example, Simeral (1978) explores it from the perspective of the Marxist concept of the reserve army of labor. Hartmann (1976) looks at the process through which women were excluded from male dominated occupations. See Wertheimer (1977) for a history from the Colonies to 1914.

5. Carol Gilligan (1982) provides research evidence on a long-standing feminist claim that women have different moral values than men. This may point to different ways of dealing with conflict and subordination, in contrast to common notions that women are passive and docile.

6. The association between aggressive masculinity and the devaluing of women has been discussed by a number of authors, particularly those working in the psychoanalytic framework. Men's motive to dominate women is seen as arising from their fear and envy of the female and men's tenuous masculine identity. The source of these feelings is in the exclusive mother-child tie of early childhood. In order to establish masculine identity, boys must break away from this tie to the mother and they do this by defining masculinity as what is non-feminine. In the process, femininity itself takes on negative connotations. While I do not agree with the analysis that locates the genesis of male dominance in the attachment between mother and child. I base my arguments about the connections between masculinity and the subordination of women in capitalist societies on some of the same observations. See Stockard and Johnson (1979) for an interesting discussion of

the literature on this problem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acker, Joan, 1980. "Women and stratification: A review of recent literature." Contemporary Sociology 1980, Vol. 9 (January): 25-39.

Barrett, Michelle, 1980. Women's Oppression Today. London: Verso.

Berk, R.A. and S.F. Berk, 1979. Labor and Leisure at Home: Content and Organization of the Household Day. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Bernard, Jessie, 1981. "Good Provider role: its a rise and fall." American Psychologist 36, January: 1-12.

Bernard, Jessie, 1981. The Female World, New York, The Free Press.

Burris, Val and Amy Wharton, 1982. "Sex Segregation in the U.S. Labor Force," The Review of Radical Political Economics, Vol. 14, No. 3 (Fall): 43-56.

Comer, Lee, 1978. "Women and Class: The Question of Women and Class." Women's Studies International Quarterly. I:165-173.

Connell, R.W., et al., 1982. Making the Difference: Schools, Families and Social Division, London: Allen Unwin.

Cook, Alice H., 1983. Comparable Worth: The Problem and States' Approaches to Wage Equity. University of Hawaii at Manoa: Industrial Relations Center.

Elson, Dorothy and Ruth Pearson, 1981. "Nimble Fingers Make Cheap Workers: An Analysis of Women's Employment in Third World Export Manufacturing," Feminist Review, (Spring): 87-107.

Enarson, Elaine Pitt, 1981. Sexuality in the Workplace: A Study

of Outdoor Women Workers in the Forest Service. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs, 1981. Women in Law, New York: Basic Books.

Gilligan, Carol, 1982. In a Different Voice, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gronseth, Erik, 1971. "The Husband Provider Role: A Critical Appraisal," in Andree Michel (ed.), Family Issues of Employed Women in Europe and America. Leiden: E.J.Brill.

Hartmann, Heidi, "Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex," Signs 1, 3, Part 2:137-70.

Johnson, Miriam M., Jean Stockard, Joan Acker and Claudeen Nafzigger, 1975. "Expressiveness Reevaluated," School Review, 83:617-44.

Keller, Evelyn Fox, 1983. "Gender and Science," in Sandra Harding and Merill B. Hintikka (eds.), Discovering Reality, Dordecht, Holland: B. Reidel.

Moen, Phyllis, "Continuities and Discontinuities in Women's Labor Force Activity," in Glen H. Elder, Jr. (ed.), Life Course Dynamics: 1960 to 1980s. Social Science Research Council (in press).

Phillips, Anne and Taylor, Barbara, 1980. "Sex and Skill: Notes Toward a Feminist Economics." Feminist Review, No. 6:79-88.

Plotke, David, 1980. "The United States in Transition: Toward a New Order?" Socialist Review, No. 54 (Vol. 10, No. 6) Nov.-Dec.:71-124.

Rowbotham, Sheila, Lynne Segal, and Hilary Waingright, 1979.

Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of the Socialism. London: Merlin.

Sargent, Lydia (ed.), 1981. The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. London Pluto Press.

Sattell, Jack W., 1982. "The Inexpressive Male: Tragedy or Sexual Politics?" in Rachel Kan-Hut, Arlene Kaplan Daniels, and Richard Colvard (eds.), Women and Work, New York: Oxford.

Schlozman, Kay Lehman, 1976. "Coping with the American Dream: Maintaining Self-Respect in an Achieving Society," Politics and Society, 6, 2, 241-263.

Sen, Gita, 1980. "The Sexual Division of Labor and the Working class Family: Towards a Conceptual Synthesis of Class Relations and the Subordination of Women." The Review of Radical Political Economics, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Summer): 76-86.

Sennett, Richard and Jonathan Cobb, 1973. The Hidden Injuries of Class. N.Y.: Vintage.

Simeral, Magaret H., "Women and the Reserve Army of Labor, Insurgent Sociologist, 8, 2 and 3.

Smith, Dorothy, 1977a. "Some implications of a sociology for women," in Nona Glazer and Helen Waehrer, eds. Woman in a Man-Made World: A Socioeconomic Handbook 2nd ed. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Smith, Dorothy, 1977b. Feminism and Marxism: A Place to Begin, A Way to Go, Vancouver, Canada: New Star Books.

Smith, Dorothy, 1979. "A sociology for women." In Julia A. Sherman and Evelyn Torton Beck, eds. The Prism of Sex: Essays in the sociology of knowledge. Madison: University of

Wisconsin Press.

Sokoloff, Natalie, 1980. Between Money and Love The Dialectics of Women's Home and Market Work. N.Y.: Praeger.

Stewart, Katie, 1981. "The Marriage of Capitalist and Patriarchal Ideologies: Meanings of Male Bonding and Male Ranking in U.S. Culture." in Lydia argent, (ed.), The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. London: Pluto Press.

Stockard, Jean and Miriam M. Johnson, 1980. Sex Roles: Sex Inequality and Sex Role Development. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Thompson, E.P., 1978. The Poverty of Theory, London: Merlin Press.

Thompson, E.P., 1963. The Making of the English Working Class, New York: Vintage.

Tolson, Andrew, 1977. The Limits of Masculinity, New York: Harper and Row.

Treiman, Donald J. and Heidi I. Hartmann, 1981. Women, Work, and Wages. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Vanek, Joann, 1978. "Housewives as Workers," in Ann Stromberg and Shirley Harkess, eds., Women Working. Palo Alto Mayfield.

Wright, Eric Olin, and Luca Perrone, 1977. "Marxist class categories and income inequality." American Sociological Review 42, 1:32-55.

Wright, Erik Olin, Cynthia Costello, David Hachen, and Joey Sprague,1982. "The American Class Structure." American Sociological Review, 47, 6 (December): 709-726.

Wertheimer, Barbara Mayer, 1977. We Were There: The Story of

Working Women in America. New York: Pantheon.

Willis, Paul E., 1980. *"Learning to Labour*, Westmead, England: Gower.

Young, Iris, 1980. "Socialist Feminism and the Limits of Dual Systems Theory," *Socialist Review*, No. 50/51 (Vol. 10, No. 2/3) March-June: 169-188.